

REMARKS

Claims 36-48 are pending. The previously existing claims have been cancelled in favor of new claims 36-48.

Applicants hereby confirm the election of Group I, including claims directed to a p-menthane-3,8-diol (PMD) composition. Such subject matter was originally recited by claims 6-8, 10-12, 18, 19, 24, 25 and 31-33. While each of the listed claims of Group I has been cancelled, the new claims are directed to products or compositions including a p-menthane-3,8-diol (PMD) composition. In any event, Applicant expressly reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications, containing claims reciting non-elected subject matter.

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which is considered the invention. However, in light of the cancellation of claims 31 and 32, Applicant respectfully submits that this particular rejection is moot.

Each of claims 6-8, 10-12, 18-24 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by at least one of Sikinami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,017,377); Lett et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,298,250); Current Science (vol. 76, no. 6, pp 836-839); Shono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,698,209); and Int J. Pharmacog (vol 32, no. 4, pp. 337-345). However, in light of the cancellation of each of these claims, reconsideration is requested.

New claims are directed to various forms of an effective amount of p-menthane-3,8-diol (PMD), and a non-toxic carrier, as a pharmaceutical composition or product suitable for insertion into the human body. For example, claims 36-40 recite additional components of the pharmaceutical composition, while claims 41-46 recite physical forms into which the pharmaceutical composition may be incorporated, and claims 46-47 are particularly directed to a system for spraying the pharmaceutical composition.

In particular, new claims 36-40 include a non-toxic carrier that is suitable for insertion into the human body. In contrast, the cited references discuss substantially different carriers, if at all. For example, each of Shono et al, Sikinami et al., and Lett et al. are directed to insect repellants, while Int. J. Pharmacog and Current Science, are directed to antifungal materials, i.e., compositions not designed to be used internal to the body. Thus, the cited references fail to teach each feature recited by the present claims.

New claims 41-46 recite that the product (including an effective amount of PMD) is in a form not taught by the cited references, e.g., a liquid such as a detergent, a solid such as a dishcloth, lozenge, toiletry, or deodorant. Finally, new claims 47 and 48 recite an antiseptic system utilizing an electrostatic spraying means, which is not disclosed by the cited references.

In light of the amendments and arguments provided above, Applicants respectfully present that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/EPR
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 31435

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: Feb 6, 2003